	Page 1
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
3	EASTERN DIVISION
4	
5	IN RE: FIRSTENERGY CORP. CIVIL ACTION NO.
	SECURITIES LITIGATION 2:20-cv-3785
6	
7	
	THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:
8	ALL ACTIONS.
9	
10	CONFIDENTIAL
11	UNDER THE PROTECTIVE ORDER
12	
13	
14	HEARING HELD BEFORE
	SPECIAL MASTER SHAWN JUDGE
15	
16	
	Thursday, November 2, 2023
17	11:02 A.M.
18	
19	Taken remotely via Zoom videoconference
20	
21	DEDODEED: DAMELA C CREENETEL COR DOS
2.2	REPORTER: PAMELA S. GREENFIELD, CRR, RDR
22	
23	Tob No. 6006570
24	Job No. 6296570
25	

```
Page 2
1
     APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:
2
     For the Class Plaintiffs:
3
            ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN & DOWD LLP
4
                 JASON FORGE, ESQ.
                 RACHEL A. COCALIS, ESQ.
            BY:
5
            BY:
                 STEVEN W. PEPICH, ESQ.
                 LUCAS OLTS, ESQ.
            BY:
            BY:
                 KEVIN S. SCIARANI, ESQ.
6
            BY: FRANCIS KARAM, ESQ.
7
            BY: ASHLEY M. KELLY, ESO.
            BY: CHRISTOPHER GILROY, ESQ.
8
            655 West Broadway
            San Diego, California 92101
9
            jforge@rgrdlaw.com
            rcocalis@rgrdlaw.com
10
            spepich@rgrdlaw.com
            lolts@rgrdlaw.com
11
            fkaram@rgrdlaw.com
            kscariani@rgrdlaw.com
12
            cgilroy@rgrdlaw.com
            akelly@rgrdlaw.com
13
            -and-
14
            MURRAY MURPHY MOUL + BASIL LLP
15
                 JOSEPH MURRAY, ESQ.
            1114 Dublin Road
16
            Columbus, Ohio 43215
            murray@mmmb.com
17
18
     For the Direct-Action Plaintiffs:
19
            LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP:
20
                MICHAEL MIARMI, ESQ.
            250 Hudson Street
            8th Floor
21
            New York, New York 10013
22
            Mmiarmi@lchb.com
23
2.4
25
```

```
Page 3
1
     APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL: (CONTINUED)
     For Defendants Steven Strah; K. Jon Taylor; Jason
     J. Lisowski; George M. Smart; Paul T. Addison;
3
     Michael J. Anderson; Steven J. Demetriou; Julia
4
     L. Johnson; Donald T. Misheff; Thomas N.
     Mitchell; James F. O'Neil III; Christopher D.
     Pappas; Sandra Pianalto; Luis A. Reyes; Jerry Sue
5
     Thornton and Leslie M. Turner;
6
7
            JONES DAY:
            BY: GEOFFREY J. RITTS, ESQ.
8
            901 Lakeside Avenue
            Cleveland, Ohio 44114
9
            gjritts@jonesday.com
            -and-
            BY:
                 MARJORIE P. DUFFY, ESO.
10
            325 John H. McConnell Boulevard
            Suite 600
11
            Columbus, Ohio 43215
12
            mpduffy@jonesday.com
13
     For Defendant First Energy:
14
            SULLIVAN & CROMWELL LLP
            BY: DAVID M. J. REIN, ESQ.
15
            BY: SHARON L. NELLES, ESQ.
            BY: ROBERT J. GIUFFRA, JR., ESQ.
16
            BY: THOMAS R. McIVER, ESQ.
            125 Broad Street
17
            New York, New York 10004
            Reind@sullcrom.com
18
            Nelless@sullcrom.com
            GuiffraR@sullcrom.com
19
            Mcivert@sullcrom.com
20
     For Defendant Charles E. Jones:
21
            BAKER & HOSTETLER
                CAROLE S. RENDON, ESQ.
            BY:
                 RACHAEL L. ISRAEL, ESQ.
22
            BY:
            Key Tower Suite 2000
            127 Public Square
23
            Cleveland, Ohio 44114
            CRendon@bakerlaw.com
24
            Risrael@bakerlaw.com
25
```

```
Page 4
     APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL: (CONTINUED)
1
2.
    For Defendant Donald Schneider:
3
            ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE, LLP
            BY: BREE MURPHY, ESQ.
4
            1152 15th Street NW
            Columbia Center
5
            Washington, D.C. 20005
            Bmurphy@orrick.com
6
            -and-
7
           SANTEN & HUGHES
8
           By: BRIAN P. O'CONNOR, ESQ.
           600 Vine Street
           Suite 700
9
           Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
           513.721.4450
10
           Bpo@santenhughes.com
11
12
    For Defendant Michael Dowling:
1.3
            TUCKER ELLIS LLP
14
            BY: JOHN F. McCAFFREY, ESQ.
                 JOHN A. FAVRET, ESQ.
15
            950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100
            Cleveland, Ohio 44113
16
            john.mccaffrey@tuckerellis.com
            john.favret@tuckerellis.com
17
18
    For Defendant Leila Vespoli:
19
            ARNOLD & PORTER
20
            BY: AARON F. MINER, ESQ.
            BY: YIQING SHI, ESQ.
21
            250 West 55th Street
            New York, New York 10019-9710
2.2
            aaron.miner@arnoldporter.com
            yiqing.shi@arnoldporter.com
23
24
25
```

```
Page 5
1
    APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL: (CONTINUED)
2
    For Defendant John Judge:
3
4
            VORYS, SATER, SEYMOUR AND PEASE LLP
            BY: EMILY TAFT, ESO.
            301 East 4th Street
5
            Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
           Ejtaft@vorys.com
6
7
    For Defendant James Pearson:
8
            BALLARD SPAHR LLP
9
           BY: TIMOTHY D. KATSIFF, ESQ.
            BY: DAVID L. AXELROD, ESQ.
10
            1735 Market Street, 51st Floor
11
           Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
           katsifft@ballardspahr.com
            axelrodd@ballardspahr.com
12
13
14
    For Defendant Dennis Chack:
15
            MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
            BY: KAREN POHLMANN, ESO.
16
            1701 Market Street
           Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
17
           Karen.Pohlmann@morganlewis.com
18
            -and-
19
           LAPE MANSFIELD NAKASIAN & GIBSON LLC
            BY: DOUGLAS M. MANSFIELD, ESQ.
20
            9980 Brewster Lane
            Suite 150
21
           Powell, Ohio 43065
            614.763.2313
22
            dmansfield@lmng-law.com
23
2.4
2.5
```

```
Page 6
1
     APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL: (CONTINUED)
     For The Underwriter Defendants:
2
3
            DAVIS POLK & WARDWELL LLP
                 JOSHUA SHINBROT, ESQ.
4
            BY:
                 BRIAN S. WEINSTEIN, ESQ.
            450 Lexington Avenue
            New York, New York 10017
5
            Joshua.Shinbrot@davispolk.com
            Brian.Weinstein@davispolk.com
6
7
            -and-
            PORTER, WRIGHT, MORRIS & ARTHUR LLP
8
            BY: DAVID S. BLOOMFIELD, JR., ESQ.
9
            41 South High Street
            Suite 2900
            Columbus, Ohio 43215
10
            614.227.2169
            Dbloomfield@porterwright.com
11
12
    For Defendant Robert Reffner:
13
            MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
14
            BY: PAUL HELMS, ESQ.
            444 West Lake Street, Suite 4000
15
            Chicago, Illinois 60606
            phelms@mwe.com
16
            -and-
17
            BROUSE McDOWELL
18
                JOHN C. FAIRWEATHER, ESQ.
            388 South Main Street, Suite 500
19
            Akron, Ohio 44311
            jfairweather@brouse.com
20
21
     For Energy Harbor:
            ZEIGER, TIGGES & LITTLE LLP
22
            BY: STUART G. PARSELL, ESQ.
23
            41 South High Street
            3500 Huntington Center
24
            Columbus, Ohio 43215
            parsell@litohio.com
25
```

	Page 7
1 2	APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL: (CONTINUED)
	For Non-Party Ebony Yeboah-Amankwah:
3	
	SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM LLP
4	BY: MARCIE LAPE, ESQ.
	155 N. Wacker Drive
5	Chicago, Illinois 60606
	312.407.0700
6	Marcie.lape@skadden.com
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	Page 8
1	
2	P R O C E E D I N G S
3	
4	SPECIAL MASTER JUDGE: All
5	right. Today's date is November 2nd, 2023.
6	We're here regarding In Re: FirstEnergy
7	Corp. Securities Litigation status conference
8	with the special master and all parties
9	including the movant, Non-Party Ebony
10	Yeboah-Amankwah. It's Case Number
11	2:20-cv-3785.
12	Today we're going to address the
13	motion for protective order, ECF Number 552.
14	I received that yesterday through the docket
15	and by email. I have read the accompanying
16	memorandum in support and I have also read
17	what I will refer to as plaintiffs' email
18	brief submitted by Mr. Forge yesterday at
19	7:36 p.m. as well as the attachments
20	submitted with that matter.
21	Traditionally I would ask that
22	people not submit an email brief to me unless
23	requested; although Mr. Forge, you were very
24	frustrating last night because I found it
25	helpful, and so reluctantly I'd like to
24	frustrating last night because I found it

	Page 9
1	admonish you but I also probably would have
2	asked you to give me something like this
3	anyway.
4	Let's jump right into the motion
5	and then I have a few comments I'll make at
6	the end regarding the motion. So, counsel,
7	if you would enter your appearance.
8	MS. LAPE: Marcie Lape from
9	Skadden Arps on behalf of Non-Party Ebony
10	Yeboah-Amankwah.
11	SPECIAL MASTER JUDGE: Mr. Forge.
12	MR. FORGE: Jason Forge on
13	behalf of the class plaintiffs.
14	SPECIAL MASTER JUDGE: Ms. Lape,
15	whenever you're ready.
16	MS. LAPE: On behalf of our
17	client, Ebony Yeboah-Amankwah, we appreciate
18	the opportunity to be heard this morning. We
19	had hoped that this would be a matter that we
20	would resolve among the parties but that
21	wasn't the case.
22	Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah's motion is
23	really quite straightforward. She is a
24	non-party who is set to give a two-day,
25	18-hour deposition next Tuesday and

Page 10 Wednesday. She's a former employee of 1 FirstEnergy who served in a number of roles 3 in the legal department over her career including as the general counsel at the time 4 5 of the Householder indictment. In that role 6 when the company had its initial internal investigation following the indictment, 7 Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah had company oversight of 8 9 that. She participated in interviews. 10 reviewed key documents and she prepared in 11 connection with outside counsel legal 12 briefings that went to the board of 13 directors. That participation that Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah had in the internal 14 15 investigation is at the heart of the 16 privilege dispute that is now pending before 17 the Special Master here and when the motion 18 to compel remained pending in mid October we 19 reached out to plaintiffs counsel to inquire 20 about whether it was appropriate to move 21 forward with Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah's deposition planned for November 7th and 8th in light of 2.2 23 the pending privilege dispute. 24 It was clear to us that a ruling 2.5 on the pending motion to compel would have a

Page 11

material affect on the discoverability of information in Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah's deposition.

2.2

2.5

We also understood that plaintiffs' requested relief included the production of additional documents which very well likely would involve Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah as well as an order that all witnesses be ordered to answer both past and future questions related to the internal investigation. Again, issues that would really affect the testimony of Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah.

Plaintiffs initially indicated to us that they wanted to wait until after a ruling on the pending motion in order to determine whether or not to move forward with Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah's deposition but the time kept getting closer and closer and so we reached out again requesting a call and expressing our concern about moving forward and what we told plaintiffs -- and you've seen this -- is that we have concerns that if we move forward when the decision is not final, that there could be a possibility that

2.

2.2

CONFIDENTIAL UNDER THE PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 12

Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah would be forced to sit for a second deposition, and as a non-party witness who is already being forced to come in and give testimony over two days for 18 hours, it's a extremely burdensome to be forced to come back and answer questions given that this is plaintiffs' choice to move forward with a deposition notwithstanding the pending privilege dispute.

Plaintiffs declined our request to stay the deposition and also declined our request for a call, so we offered a compromise that if they wanted to move forward with the deposition, we would agree to do so but only if we had an agreement from the movants to the motion to compel that they would not then ask to reopen a deposition to elicit testimony related to those issues that are at the heart of the privilege dispute before the Special Master.

Plaintiffs again declined the offer leaving us no choice but to file the motion to compel. We need to guard against the possibility that Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah, a non-party, would be forced to sit for a

	Page 13
1	second deposition here.
2	Now, requiring her to do, sit for
3	that deposition just because plaintiffs want
4	to move forward notwithstanding the
5	uncertainty of this discovery issue is unduly
6	prejudicial to Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah, it's
7	burdensome and it's improper and as the case
8	that we cited in our motion shows In Re:
9	Subpoena of Wang, it's not, there's
10	absolutely good cause here to stay her
11	deposition until this privilege issue is
12	resolved.
13	I want to just quickly address
14	the points that Mr. Forge raised in his email
15	yesterday because I think there are a lot of
16	inaccuracies in those points.
17	SPECIAL MASTER JUDGE: Before
18	you do, if I could interrupt for just a
19	moment: Tell me your position, everyone's
20	going to get a decision on the privilege
21	issue Monday morning.
22	How does that affect your motion?
23	MS. LAPE: Well, I don't know
2 4	what that privilege decision is going to be,
25	so there's a couple things.

Page 14

So Monday morning's the day before her deposition.

2.

2.2

If you were to rule that
FirstEnergy does not have privilege or has
waived its privilege, Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah is
certainly not prepared to testify today.
She's not prepared to testify on the very
next day over matters related to the internal
investigation. She was separated from the
company in October of 2020. It's three years
later, so she does not have access to any
materials that were from that time period.
She would not have reviewed those materials.

She would, nor would plaintiffs have those materials to be ready to ask questions about the internal investigation.

If the ruling was against the movants, I understand that there is still a 21-day time period in which the plaintiffs could object and that decision may or may not be overturned and then we could be in the same position we are today where there's an uncertainty regarding the discoverability of the information that she has that FirstEnergy contends is privileged related to the

Page 15 internal investigation. 1 2. I think that the most logical 3 situation here would be to stay her deposition until after there is a final 4 5 decision in this court, so until after the 6 time period to object and there is a ruling 7 by the District Court on that. SPECIAL MASTER JUDGE: So after 8 9 the 21-day period? 10 MS. LAPE: After the 21-day 11 period, yes. 12 Now, my understanding is that the 13 parties are discussing an end of fact discovery cutoff of around April which is 14 15 five months from now, so this is all 16 secondhand knowledge of course because we're 17 not a party to the action so aren't privy to 18 all of the information, but my understanding, 19 my expectation would be that there would still be sufficient time to have 20 21 Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah's deposition, to do any 2.2 follow-up necessary discovery, and we've committed that Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah will 23 24 promptly meet and confer and be flexible with 2.5 her dates in resetting that deposition.

Page 16 SPECIAL MASTER JUDGE: 1 Okay. 2. Anything else you care to add? 3 MS. LAPE: The only other thing I would add, and it's not my job to protect 4 5 FirstEnergy's privilege by any means, but 6 another thought that I had was that if you 7 were to rule in favor of the movants on Monday and FirstEnergy sought to appeal, it 8 9 would be unlikely that a stay would be in 10 effect before the Tuesday deposition, which 11 could create some difficulties for the 12 company as well. 13 SPECIAL MASTER JUDGE: Talk to 14 me about your request for alternate relief 15 that if the deposition would be allowed to 16 proceed that you want to preclude plaintiffs 17 from reopening the deposition. 18 MS. LAPE: Well, this was a very 19 narrow compromise that we tried to develop in 20 order to move forward with the deposition as 21 plaintiff seemed to want to do. 2.2 It's not that under no 23 circumstances if there's good cause a party 24 could ever reopen the deposition. That's not 2.5 what we're asking for.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

CONFIDENTIAL UNDER THE PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 17

What we're asking for is simply that because plaintiffs desired to move forward, notwithstanding that there's five months of discovery time period left and notwithstanding that there's this privilege dispute, that then they should bear the burden of any prejudice that results from that decision to move forward and that would be simply that if Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah is asked about questions related to the internal investigation that FirstEnergy contends are privileged, that plaintiff should not thereafter be able to reopen the deposition and ask those privileged questions about the internal investigation if a decision is later determined that there is no privilege over the internal investigation.

Now, plaintiffs are correct that we did not find authority on point that granted this kind of relief but I will say that in the case that we cited in our motion, the In Re: Subpoena of Wang case, that's precisely what the movant did there: The movant asked for the stay until the court determined a privilege dispute but said but

www.veritext.com 888-391-3376

2.

2.2

CONFIDENTIAL UNDER THE PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 18

in the alternative, if the court's not inclined to grant the stay, then we would ask you to please issue an order that they would not be able to reopen the deposition in order to ask questions related to this privileged matter after the fact because they're making a decision to move forward.

Now, the court in that case declined to even consider the alternative argument because they determined there was in fact good cause to issue the stay given the pendency of the privilege dispute.

SPECIAL MASTER JUDGE: I got to say that makes very little sense to me but I think I understand, I understand the argument. I'm not surprised you didn't find a lot of case law supporting it out there but...

MS. LAPE: Well, and I think it's because, you know, first this is a very unique fact pattern so it's really trying to find a needle in a haystack as far as having a deposition of a key employee involved in an issue that there's a privilege dispute pending over, so it's really a needle in the

Page 19 1 haystack and so where it did come up, you 2. know, we saw the stay being issued. 3 SPECIAL MASTER JUDGE: Okay. I 4 appreciate that. Before I interrupted you, 5 you were going to pick apart Mr. Forge's 6 email objections. 7 Do you want to address that or 8 are some of the points you were going to say 9 moot in light of the decision I promised on 10 Monday? 11 MS. LAPE: I don't believe, I 12 think certainly there are some points that 13 I'd like to respond to that would not be moot 14 regardless of your decision. 15 SPECIAL MASTER JUDGE: Go ahead. 16 The first is that MS. LAPE: 17 Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah is not the highest 18 ranking legal employee involved in the events concerning Mr. Randazzo. In fact she's the 19 20 third highest ranking legal employee in this 21 case. 2.2 We understand also that 23 plaintiffs recently agreed to move the 24 deposition of the highest ranking legal 25 employee, who was Leila Vespoli, in part

2.

2.2

2.5

CONFIDENTIAL UNDER THE PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 20

because of this pending privilege dispute and the possibility that there could be additional documents that are produced related to the allegations.

Second, another inaccuracy is that Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah did not agree to the November 7th and 8th deposition dates while the motion to compel was pending.

Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah was served the subpoena on June 22nd and the docket reflects that the motion to compel was filed on June 30th after she had agreed to those deposition dates.

Again we understand that with an expected April deadline there would be no prejudice to plaintiffs if the deposition is stayed until there's a final privilege ruling.

Fourth, again, our requested relief, alternative relief, first it's not the primary relief that we seek and, second, it really is quite narrow and it just focused on the specific subject matter at the heart of the motion to compel which is whether or not FirstEnergy's internal investigation is privileged. We are not asking for a blanket

	Page 21
1	refusal to allow a reopening of the
2	deposition if there's good cause shown.
3	Fifth, we feel like plaintiffs'
4	offer to try to minimize the burdens to
5	Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah if there would be a
6	second deposition are insufficient to
7	overcome the well-established principle that
8	bars non-party witnesses from sitting for
9	multiple-day depositions. Federal Rule of
10	Civil Procedure 45 really requires that a
11	party not place an undue burden on a
12	non-party, and finally
13	SPECIAL MASTER JUDGE: Explain
14	to me in detail what the burden would be
15	here.
16	MS. LAPE: The burden for
17	Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah?
18	SPECIAL MASTER JUDGE: Yes.
19	MS. LAPE: Well, the deposition
20	in the first instance here, as you know, is
21	quite rare to have a two-day deposition with
22	18 hours multiple parties asking her
23	questions.
24	Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah has, is not
25	employed by FirstEnergy. She's the vice

	Page 22
1	president of compliance and ethics at another
2	publicly traded company, so she is already
3	taking off significant time from work in
4	order to prepare for the deposition.
5	SPECIAL MASTER JUDGE: How much
6	time?
7	MS. LAPE: Well, probably it
8	will be a full week between prep sessions and
9	the two days of deposition, so five full days
10	taking off from work already for the two-day
11	deposition now and then if she's required to
12	sit for a second deposition and there's
13	additional documents that are produced and
14	that will require additional topics that she
15	can be questioned about, that will require us
16	to prepare her once again and for her to take
17	off additional time from her job.
18	SPECIAL MASTER JUDGE: Has she
19	already sat for several days of prep?
20	MS. LAPE: She has sat for some
21	prep sessions and we have additional prep
22	sessions set for the next couple days.
23	SPECIAL MASTER JUDGE: Okay. Go
24	ahead. I'm sorry I interrupted you.
25	MS. LAPE: No, that's fine.

Page 23 And then the final, just to 1 2. address Mr. Forge's offer of moving the 3 deposition to November 29th or 30th or December 1st, you know, while we appreciated 4 5 that offer, we felt like it was a band-aid 6 approach here given the ability to object to 7 any decision and the uncertainty of when a decision would come out. 8 9 We did not believe that that 10 would cover that 21-day objection period and 11 give an opportunity for there to be a final 12 court order here. 13 SPECIAL MASTER JUDGE: All right. 14 Thank you. 15 MS. LAPE: Thank you. 16 SPECIAL MASTER JUDGE: Mr. Forge. 17 MR. FORGE: Thank you, 18 Mr. Judge. I'll start by debunking the 19 attempted debunking of the email. 20 And I'll just go in reverse order 21 of what counsel is discussing. 2.2 I really appreciate the way you 23 get to the point on these matters with your 24 questions and I think it's clear from the 25 responses regarding the burden that there is

Page 24 no threat of a unique burden here with this 1 witness. 3 She has already been questioned by one governmental entity regarding some of 4 5 her conduct with FirstEnergy. Clearly she was 6 prepped for that. She sat through a 7 deposition there. She's -- counsel has acknowledged 8 9 that she's already had some days, she was 10 vague about how many, to prep for this 11 deposition and the reality is that if she 12 doesn't want to prepare, she doesn't have to 13 prepare. 14 If she doesn't recall the answer 15 to a question, that is a perfectly acceptable 16 response to a question. 17 I don't want to butcher Mark 18 Twain's quote but I know to paraphrase it, 19 it's something along the lines of as long as 20 you tell the truth, you don't have to remember anything. And that's all she has to 21 2.2 do is tell the truth. If the truth is she doesn't 23 24 remember the answer to a question, that's 25 totally acceptable.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

CONFIDENTIAL UNDER THE PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 25

Counsel remarked that this is quite rare, what is going on, as far as she has a two-day deposition and it is out of the ordinary, but this case is out of the ordinary. It is the largest public corruption scheme in the history of the State of Ohio and one of the largest in the country's history and quite frankly Ms. Amankwah was at the heart of it. She was FirstEnergy's chief ethics officer for much of the period of this conduct, and that has nothing to do with the internal investigation. It does have everything to do with her engaging in misconduct herself, and we have emails to that effect. unquestionably conspired to conceal an arrangement with Sam Randazzo.

That is probably one of the reasons why counsel waited until the midnight hour to file their motion for protective order, so we couldn't provide you with the email evidence in which she is openly discussing structuring payments to

Mr. Randazzo to avoid signature requirements at FirstEnergy, she is openly discussing ways

2.

2.2

CONFIDENTIAL UNDER THE PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 26

that they can avoid having to disclose side agreements and basically payoffs with Mr. Randazzo and openly discussing keeping the relationship with Mr. Randazzo off budget.

So we are not talking about a completely disinterested third party. She is at the eye of this hurricane and that has nothing to do with the post-arrest internal investigation and because she was -- and so in terms of her role, she was the highest ranking member of the legal department that was directly dealing with this issue.

First of all, for some of the period she was literally the highest ranking member of the legal department, she was the general counsel; but even for the period before she was the general counsel, even when you have a Mr. Reffner or Ms. Vespoli, who were superior to her, they weren't the ones dealing directly with Sam Randazzo. She was.

So I, frankly I believe that you'll see why I disagree with Mr. Jones' and Mr. Dowling's defense, I think it will come into much sharper focus with this witness

Page 27 1 because you and the jury will eventually see 2. just how integrally involved and how complicit the chief ethics officer was at 3 FirstEnergy with much of this conduct which I 4 5 believe, respectfully, all jurors will find to be misconduct, you know, what she was 6 7 engaged in. So she is, she was the highest 8 9 ranking member of the in-house legal team 10 involved in directly dealing with Sam 11 Randazzo. 12 Regarding the timing of things, 13 even counsel's description confirms that the subpoena was June 22nd. The motion was 14 submitted on June 30th. She still had two 15 16 days to object to the timing of the 17 deposition. Of course she had months after 18 that to object. There were discussions about 19 the location. Never once raised a request to 20 postpone or wait until the decision; but 21 thankfully you've exposed the hollowness of 2.2 that argument because you've told us the decision is coming out on Monday. 23 24 So whether they want to site the 25 In Re: Subpoena to Wang or any other

Page 28

argument, the decision will be made Monday.

2.

2.2

Counsel is wrong again, the deposition is not starting Monday. The deposition starts Tuesday. That is after the decision.

Again, this was withheld from you but now it's out in the open: We offered to move the deposition three weeks, a little over three weeks; and rather than engage, rather than accept that offer, which would fully address every single point that she made, they just went silent and then waited until the midnight hour to file the motion for protective order so I think that sheds a lot of light on what the real intentions are here, which is to completely disrupt what is not just plaintiffs' litigation and discovery plan but also the discovery plan for Defendants Jones and Dowling because we have a number of depositions set up already.

A number of those depositions include Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah's former subordinates. We need her deposition testimony first and then we're going to depose them. That is our prerogative to

Page 29 1 schedule these depositions as we deem to be 2. in the best interest of the class. Counsel does not address at all the need for 3 follow-up discovery and while it's not her 4 5 job to respect our need for follow-up 6 discovery, it is my job and it is completely 7 impractical to move this deposition into 2024 which, by the way, the first two months have 8 9 already gotten pretty crowded. We would be 10 talking about a, needing as late as March of 11 2024 deposition and that will make it 12 impossible for us to do follow-up discovery, 13 again for the highest ranking member of the 14 in-house legal team dealing directly with Sam 15 Randazzo. 16 SPECIAL MASTER JUDGE: So let me 17 ask you this: Just assume for the sake of 18 argument that I rule in your favor Monday on 19 the privilege issue. You're inclined to go 20 ahead with her deposition on Tuesday and 21 Wednesday, correct? 2.2 Or, again, I'm MR. FORGE: Yes. 23 still happy to move it to the 30th and the 24 31st. 2.5 SPECIAL MASTER JUDGE: And for a

Page 30 continued deposition down the road, you would 1 2. not assume that you are entitled to that but 3 you would have to demonstrate good cause for 4 that, correct? 5 Absolutely. I made MR. FORGE: 6 that clear to counsel as well. 7 SPECIAL MASTER JUDGE: Okay. 8 Thank you. 9 MR. FORGE: I've never suggested 10 that we get an automatic do-over or to 11 reopen; but even that, I think your questions 12 and counsel's answers have revealed we're not 13 talking about an extreme burden. You know, I 14 threw out, and again counsel chose not to 15 engage whatsoever, but I said look, we'll be 16 talking about limited subjects, a limited 17 duration. We could do it remotely. It is, 18 if her deposition has to be reopened, it 19 would definitely be for, you know, no more 20 than one day, not even a full day. 21 I don't want to pre-argue that 22 because we're speculating about whether it 23 does need to be reopened but I'm simply 24 suggesting that this entire exercise is based 25 on their speculation that we are going to ask

2.

2.2

2.5

CONFIDENTIAL UNDER THE PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 31

to reopen the deposition, and what I'm saying is even that speculative argument is not some sort of apocalyptic outcome.

There's nothing unduly burdensome about a witness who was integrally involved in this type of significant activity to submit to a deposition for an additional few hours.

Again I'm not trying to pre-argue it. I'm just suggesting that even if the worst case scenario by their argument comes true, we're still not talking about a tremendous burden.

So what it all comes back to is the fact that this is their burden. We have legal standards for a reason and I know that you like to stick to the facts and stick to the law, and that's the best way to proceed. That's the only efficient way to get through this.

They have not met their burden.

They have not met their burden of showing that going forward after the decision has been rendered is going to be somehow unduly burdensome to her. They haven't shown any

Page 32 1 burden whatsoever to proceeding, so they 2. haven't met their burden at all. 3 Regarding the risk of us asking to reopen the deposition, again, these are 4 5 all arguments they can make in opposition to 6 it but we can protect against pretty much 7 everything counsel raised if we move the deposition to November 30th and December 1st, 8 9 she'll get the decision, everybody will get 10 the decision on Monday. That will give over three weeks to do whatever counsel wants with 11 12 the information. 13 Likewise if we proceed on 14 Tuesday, we will have the decision and the 15 witness can answer all the questions that 16 she's entitled to answer given the decision. 17 So under either of those --18 SPECIAL MASTER JUDGE: If I can interrupt for a moment, I think one of her 19 20 concerns, if I am inferring correctly, is 21 that, you know, one side or the other has to 22 appeal the privilege issue. You know, if

Magistrate Judge Jolson and Chief Judge

they're going to be dissatisfied with my

decision Monday, they're likely to object.

23

24

25

2.2

CONFIDENTIAL UNDER THE PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 33

Marbley, what if they don't rule on it before the November 30th date, where does that leave everybody?

MR. FORGE: That's a great point because that's what to me exposes what's so problematic about making decisions based on speculation because you could, first of all, anybody could make that argument in any case that oh, someone might want to reopen this deposition down the road, therefore we should not have the deposition.

Look, is it possible that someone will object to your decision? Yes, it's possible. Is it possible that we won't have a decision within three weeks? Yes. Is it possible we won't have a decision on the objection within three months? Yes, that is also possible. And that's why it's so problematic to start making decisions when we're heaping one level of speculation upon another upon another.

We're just doing the best that we can and we know for absolute certain that

Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah has extremely relevant information that has, that predates the

2.

2.2

CONFIDENTIAL UNDER THE PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 34

internal investigation so I know we're going to make productive use of our time if we depose her starting Tuesday or, you know, the 8th or if we start deposing her on November 30th. If we depose her in November of 2023, I know we are going to make productive use of everyone's time. We are not going to waste her time. We are not going to waste our time. It will be extremely productive.

Whether we wind up asking to reopen to explore other issues post-dating those events is really not what should be controlling here. We can only deal with what we know at the time; and what we know right now is she has extremely relevant information that predates the internal investigation and that will almost certainly trigger the need for follow-up discovery and so we really need to take this deposition in November.

I'm not trying to draw a hard line that it has to be Tuesday or bust. I'm willing to wait until November 30th, but I can send you the schedule. It's a very crowded deposition schedule. That's the best I can do and counsel hasn't pointed to any

Page 35 1 reason why that wouldn't at least help; and 2. so to the extent they want perfection, it 3 just doesn't exist in the law. We are never going to have complete certainty. 4 5 SPECIAL MASTER JUDGE: Thank 6 you. 7 Brief rebuttal, if any. Yeah, I'd just like 8 MS. LAPE: 9 to respond to a couple points, please. 10 So counsel keeps suggesting that 11 I'm asking you to make decisions based on 12 speculation and that there's no indication 13 that they would even seek to reopen 14 Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah's deposition; but if you 15 look at the relief that they're seeking in 16 the motion to compel, they have asked as a 17 primary leaf in the motion to compel that FirstEnergy must produce all previously 18 19 withheld documents and witnesses must answer 20 all questions past and future related to the 21 internal investigation. 2.2 So the relief they seek suggests 23 that if she is asked questions that are 24 protected as privileged during a deposition, 2.5 that they would then be able to and force her

Page 36 1 to ask -- or to answer those same questions 2. again. It's primary relief that they are 3 seeking in the motion to compel. This is not speculative on my part thinking that they 4 5 might later seek to reopen the deposition. Second, clearly we disagree with 6 7 all of the factual characterizations that Mr. Forge made. She was not intimately 8 9 involved in any of the bad acts in this case. 10 She was not the highest ranking legal 11 employee, but I don't think that this is the 12 time to be arguing merits before you. 13 We're not asking you to 14 completely disrupt the discovery plan. We're 15 asking for a brief stay so that this 16 privilege issue can be resolved. As you 17 recognized, November 29th is not going to 18 finally resolve the privilege issue. 19 We are very flexible in 20 rescheduling dates. We are, we recognize 21 that a ruling on the privilege issue has 2.2 already been determined by the court, that it will extend the fact discovery deadline and 23 24 certainly there will be opportunity for

Veritext Legal Solutions
www.veritext.com
888-391-3376

Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah's complete testimony over

2.5

Page 37 both pre July 2020 actions and post 2020 1 2. actions including the internal investigation 3 should you issue the stay. SPECIAL MASTER JUDGE: Thank 4 5 you. 6 Final question for you: Why wait 7 till yesterday to file? MS. LAPE: Well, we had been 8 9 trying to reach plaintiffs counsel for 10 several weeks. Had attempted to have phone 11 conversations with them. We, initially they 12 indicated that they wanted to wait for you to 13 issue your ruling and then I believe we found 14 out on Monday that they plan to go forward. 15 This is all in Mr. Forge's email 16 exchange that he copied you on or that he 17 provided to you yesterday. We asked for the alternative relief, said we would agree to 18 19 move forward if you would agree to this 20 limited relief and we had also reached out to Jones' and Dowling's counsel as well to see 21 22 what their position would be. We heard back 23 from Jones' counsel yesterday morning and we 24 put together the motion for protective order 25 and got it on file as quickly as we could.

Page 38 1 Now, as far as why we waited from 2. the June time period, again we're not a party to the case. We weren't involved in the back 3 and forth and didn't have knowledge guite 4 5 frankly of what the timeline was. believed it would be resolved before her 6 7 deposition and that it would not be an issue and it wasn't until the deposition got closer 8 9 that we realized that it was in fact an 10 issue. 11 We also understood over that 12 period of time that there had been multiple other depositions that had been moved for 13 14 this very reason and so it was quite frankly 15 a surprise to us in that plaintiffs would 16 want to move forward with this deposition 17 given this pretty significant privilege 18 dispute which really is at the heart of 19 what's discoverable with respect to our 20 client. 21 SPECIAL MASTER JUDGE: 22 appreciate that. 23 Anything else? 24 MS. LAPE: No, your Honor. 2.5 SPECIAL MASTER JUDGE:

Page 39 Thank you both. 1 The matter is taken under 2. advisement with a decision to be issued in 3 due course. I would anticipate issuing that 4 5 as part of the bundle on Monday. 6 I remind you that absent a stay, 7 that any orders of the Special Master go into effect, they need to either be stayed by 8 9 myself, Magistrate Judge Jolson or Chief 10 Judge Marbley. So please keep that in mind 11 as you make your decisions. 12 I encourage the parties to keep 13 discussing any possible resolutions to this 14 matter between now and Monday. I anticipate 15 -- on Tuesday of this week I cleared, I 16 cancelled everything for today, tomorrow and Saturday so I could spend the next four days 17 18 writing and get you guys more decisions than 19 you'll be happy with. 20 I anticipate there will be some 21 objections to that on Monday. We do not have 2.2 a status conference scheduled for next week; 23 however, I will be at a conference in 24 Cleveland. I can make myself available if

Veritext Legal Solutions

www.veritext.com

888-391-3376

there are any issues that arise as a result

25

Page 40 of the decisions or as a result of the 1 2. proceeding with or declining to proceed with 3 the deposition scheduled for next week. Anything else that we need to 4 5 discuss today? 6 MR. FORGE: Mr. Judge, can I 7 just ask, if I think I heard you correctly, but the decision on this issue is going to 8 9 come out on Monday also? 10 SPECIAL MASTER JUDGE: Yes. 11 MR. FORGE: Okay. And the only 12 reason I ask that is because I, I know I'm 13 being guilty of pointing out the obvious but 14 there are a number, you know, we do have 15 several dozen people, I know you invited us 16 to continue discussing it. I'm fine, you 17 I don't want to inconvenience several know. 18 dozen people if, you know, November 30th would be just fine. I put the offer out 19 20 there. 21 I don't know that it's, if that's 22 what it takes, I would rather agree to that 23 now than keep everybody in limbo until 24 Monday; but if there's any quidance you could 25 offer along those lines sooner than Monday, I

	Page 41
1	would really appreciate it.
2	MR. McCAFFREY: Mr. Judge, John
3	McCaffrey on behalf of movant Michael
4	Dowling. To underscore Mr. Forge's position,
5	the deposition is scheduled to occur in
6	Cleveland starting Tuesday morning.
7	I know that we have counsel
8	coming in from out of town. They would, that
9	had may affect their ability to cancel
10	flights or make other arrangements. I just
11	wanted to make the Court aware of that.
12	SPECIAL MASTER JUDGE: I mean,
13	if no one has any objection, I can tell you
14	the result right now but I'm not going to be
15	able to get it written and filed before
16	Monday. Would that be helpful to everyone?
17	MR. McCAFFREY: That would be
18	helpful to Mr. Dowling.
19	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That would
20	be helpful to all counsel that have to travel
21	on Monday.
22	MS. LAPE: That would also be
23	helpful to us. I don't know that you
24	know, a decision on this without
25	understanding the decision on the overall

	Page 42
1	privilege dispute is a little concerning
2	although, so I will say that we would be
3	amenable to the November 30th/December 1st
4	date as a alternative; although, you know,
5	obviously we'll have to see what the parties
6	do after your decision is made on the
7	underlying dispute.
8	SPECIAL MASTER JUDGE: I
9	understand.
10	Mr. Forge, response?
11	MR. FORGE: Sooner is better,
12	Mr. Judge. I would really appreciate it.
13	Not just personally, but for everybody else.
14	SPECIAL MASTER JUDGE: Yeah.
15	The decision on the underlying dispute will
16	be issued Monday. The decision, the written
17	decision on the motion for protective order
18	that was filed yesterday will be coming
19	Monday.
20	The decision that I will be
21	making that I can give you today is motion
22	denied.
23	MR. FORGE: Thank you.
24	SPECIAL MASTER JUDGE: So
25	proceed with the deposition next week if you

	Page 43
1	are inclined. If not, kick it down the road.
2	I ask that you let me know either way just so
3	my own edification, but I will be getting
4	written orders out on, memorializing this
5	decision, explaining the rationale, and on
6	the all the other pending motions on Monday.
7	MR. FORGE: Thank you.
8	MS. LAPE: Thank you.
9	SPECIAL MASTER JUDGE: Anything
10	else from anyone we need to address?
11	MR. FORGE: Not from class
12	plaintiffs. Thank you.
13	SPECIAL MASTER JUDGE: All
14	right. Thank you all for your time. We will
15	reconvene in two weeks. If I'm needed before
16	then as a result of the decisions or
17	otherwise, please reach out by email or
18	telephone. Thank you.
19	And thank you for your efforts,
20	Pam. If anyone orders the transcript, it
21	need not be expedited but send a copy to me
22	as soon as it's available to you.
23	It's not necessary that I receive
24	one before Monday, although it's helpful but
25	not necessary. I took pretty copious notes

```
Page 44
       while we were talking today. Thank you.
 1
 2
       Have a good rest of the week.
 3
          (Proceedings concluded at 11:46 a.m.)
 4
 5
 6
 7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

www.veritext.com 888-391-3376

	Page 45
1	
2	
3	CERTIFICATE
4	
5	I, Pamela S. Greenfield, a Notary Public
6	within and for the State of Ohio, do hereby
7	certify that I attended the foregoing
8	proceedings in their entirety, that I wrote the
9	same in stenotypy, and that this is a true and
10	correct transcript of my stenotype notes.
11	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set
12	my hand and seal of office, at Cleveland, Ohio,
13	this 2nd day of November, 2023.
14	
15	entifica-
16	Parla S. State The State of the
17	
18	
	Pamela S. Greenfield, CRR, RDR
19	Notary Public, State of Ohio
	My commission expires July 2, 2028
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

[& - addison] Page 1

&	2023 1:16 8:5	44113 4:15	9
& 2:3,19 3:14	34:5 45:13	44114 3:8,23	901 3:8
3:21 4:3,7,19	2024 29:7,11	44311 6:19	92101 2:8
5:15,19 6:3,8	2028 45:19	444 6:14	950 4:15
6:13,22 7:3	21 14:19 15:9	45 21:10	9980 5:20
1	15:10 23:10	450 6:4	
	22nd 20:10	45202 4:9 5:5	a
10004 3:17	27:14	4th 5:5	a.m. 1:17 44:4
10013 2:21	250 2:20 4:21	5	aaron 4:20
10017 6:5	25705 45:16	500 6:18	aaron.miner
10019-9710	2900 6:9	513.721.4450	4:22
4:21	29th 23:3 36:17	4:10	ability 23:6
1100 4:15	2:20 1:5 8:11		41:9
1114 2:15	2nd 8:5 45:13	51st 5:10	able 17:13 18:4
1152 4:4	3	552 8:13	35:25 41:15
11:02 1:17		55th 4:21	absent 39:6
11:46 44:4	301 5:5	6	absolute 33:23
125 3:16	30th 20:11 23:3	600 3:11 4:8	absolutely
127 3:23	27:15 29:23	60606 6:15 7:5	13:10 30:5
150 5:20	32:8 33:2 34:5	614.227.2169	accept 28:10
155 7:4	34:22 40:18	6:10	acceptable
15th 4:4	42:3	614.763.2313	24:15,25
1701 5:16	312.407.0700	5:21	access 14:11
1735 5:10	7:5	6296570 1:24	accompanying
18 9:25 12:4	31st 29:24	655 2:8	8:15
21:22	325 3:10	7	acknowledged
19103 5:11,16	3500 6:23	-	24:8
1st 23:4 32:8	3785 1:5 8:11	700 4:9	action 1:5 2:18
42:3	388 6:18	7:36 8:19	15:17
2	4	7th 10:22 20:7	actions 1:8
	4000 6:14	8	37:1,2
2 1:16 45:19	41 6:9,23	8th 2:21 10:22	activity 31:6
2000 3:22	43065 5:21	20:7 34:4	acts 36:9
20005 4:5	43215 2:16		add 16:2,4
2020 14:10	3:11 6:10,24		addison 3:3
37:1,1	3.11 0.10,27		

[additional - ballardspahr.com]

	T .		
additional 11:6	amankwah 7:2	appreciate 9:17	asking 16:25
20:3 22:13,14	8:10 9:10,17	19:4 23:22	17:1 20:25
22:17,21 31:7	10:8,14 11:7	38:22 41:1	21:22 32:3
address 8:12	11:13 12:1,24	42:12	34:10 35:11
13:13 19:7	13:6 14:5	appreciated	36:13,15
23:2 28:11	15:23 17:9	23:4	assume 29:17
29:3 43:10	19:17 20:6,9	approach 23:6	30:2
admonish 9:1	21:5,17,24	appropriate	attachments
advisement	25:9 33:24	10:20	8:19
39:3	amankwah's	april 15:14	attempted
affect 11:1,12	9:22 10:21	20:14	23:19 37:10
13:22 41:9	11:2,18 15:21	argue 30:21	attended 45:7
agree 12:14	28:22 35:14	31:9	authority 17:19
20:6 37:18,19	36:25	arguing 36:12	automatic
40:22	amenable 42:3	argument	30:10
agreed 19:23	anderson 3:3	18:10,16 27:22	available 39:24
20:12	answer 11:9	28:1 29:18	43:22
agreement	12:6 24:14,24	31:2,11 33:8	avenue 3:8 4:15
12:15	32:15,16 35:19	arguments	6:4
agreements	36:1	32:5	avoid 25:24
26:2	answers 30:12	arnold 4:19	26:1
ahead 19:15	anticipate 39:4	arnoldporter	aware 41:11
22:24 29:20	39:14,20	4:22,22	axelrod 5:10
aid 23:5	anybody 33:8	arps 7:3 9:9	axelrodd 5:12
akelly 2:12	anyway 9:3	arrangement	b
akron 6:19	apart 19:5	25:17	back 12:6
allegations	apocalyptic	arrangements	31:14 37:22
20:4	31:3	41:10	
allow 21:1	appeal 16:8	arrest 26:9	38:3
allowed 16:15	32:22	arthur 6:8	bad 36:9
alternate 16:14	appearance 9:7	ashley 2:7	baker 3:21
alternative	appearances	asked 9:2 17:10	bakerlaw.com
18:1,9 20:19	2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1	17:24 35:16,23	3:24,24
37:18 42:4	6:1 7:1	37:17	ballard 5:9
			ballardspahr
			5:11,12

[band - complete]

_			_
band 23:5	brouse 6:17	cause 13:10	cleared 39:15
bars 21:8	brouse.com	16:23 18:11	clearly 24:5
based 30:24	6:19	21:2 30:3	36:6
33:6 35:11	budget 26:5	center 4:4 6:23	cleveland 3:8
basically 26:2	bundle 39:5	certain 33:23	3:23 4:15
basil 2:14	burden 17:7	certainly 14:6	39:24 41:6
bear 17:6	21:11,14,16	19:12 34:17	45:12
behalf 9:9,13	23:25 24:1	36:24	client 9:17
9:16 41:3	30:13 31:13,15	certainty 35:4	38:20
believe 19:11	31:21,22 32:1	certify 45:7	closer 11:19,19
23:9 26:22	32:2	cgilroy 2:12	38:8
27:5 37:13	burdens 21:4	chack 5:14	cocalis 2:4
believed 38:6	burdensome	characterizati	columbia 4:4
bernstein 2:19	12:5 13:7 31:4	36:7	columbus 2:16
best 29:2 31:18	31:25	charles 3:20	3:11 6:10,24
33:22 34:24	bust 34:21	chicago 6:15	come 12:3,6
better 42:11	butcher 24:17	7:5	19:1 23:8
blanket 20:25	c	chief 25:10	26:24 40:9
bloomfield 6:8	c 6:18 8:2 45:3	27:3 32:25	comes 31:11,14
bmurphy 4:5	45:3	39:9	coming 27:23
board 10:12	cabraser 2:19	choice 12:7,22	41:8 42:18
bockius 5:15	california 2:8	chose 30:14	comments 9:5
boulevard 3:10	call 11:20	christopher 2:7	commission
bpo 4:10	12:12	3:4	45:19
bree 4:3	cancel 41:9	cincinnati 4:9	committed
brewster 5:20	cancelled 39:16	5:5	15:23
brian 4:8 6:4	care 16:2	circumstances	company 10:6
brian.weinstein	career 10:3	16:23	10:8 14:10
6:6	carole 3:21	cited 13:8	16:12 22:2
brief 8:18,22	case 8:10 9:21	17:21	compel 10:18
35:7 36:15	13:7 17:21,22	civil 1:5 21:10	10:25 12:16,23
briefings 10:12	18:8,17 19:21	class 2:2 9:13	20:8,11,23
broad 3:16	25:4 31:11	29:2 43:11	35:16,17 36:3
broadway 2:8	33:8 36:9 38:3	clear 10:24	complete 35:4
	33.0 30.7 30.3	23:24 30:6	36:25

[completely - defendant]

Page 4

	I	I	I
completely	controlling	36:22 41:11	dbloomfield
26:7 28:16	34:13	court's 18:1	6:11
29:6 36:14	conversations	cover 23:10	deadline 20:14
compliance	37:11	create 16:11	36:23
22:1	copied 37:16	crendon 3:24	deal 34:13
complicit 27:3	copious 43:25	cromwell 3:14	dealing 26:13
compromise	copy 43:21	crowded 29:9	26:21 27:10
12:13 16:19	corp 1:5 8:7	34:24	29:14
conceal 25:16	correct 17:18	crr 1:21 45:18	debunking
concern 11:21	29:21 30:4	cutoff 15:14	23:18,19
concerning	45:10	cv 1:5 8:11	december 23:4
19:19 42:1	correctly 32:20	d	32:8 42:3
concerns 11:23	40:7	d 3:4 5:9 8:2	decision 11:24
32:20	corruption	d.c. 4:5	13:20,24 14:20
concluded 44:4	25:6	date 8:5 33:2	15:5 17:8,15
conduct 24:5	counsel 2:1 3:1	42:4	18:7 19:9,14
25:11 27:4	4:1 5:1 6:1 7:1	dates 15:25	23:7,8 27:20
confer 15:24	9:6 10:4,11,19	20:7,12 36:20	27:23 28:1,5
conference 8:7	23:21 24:8	dating 34:11	31:23 32:9,10
39:22,23	25:1,19 26:17	david 3:14 5:10	32:14,16,24
confidential	26:18 28:2	6:8	33:13,15,16
1:10	29:2 30:6,14	davis 6:3	39:3 40:8
confirms 27:13	32:7,11 34:25	davis 0.5 davispolk.com	41:24,25 42:6
connection	35:10 37:9,21	6:5,6	42:15,16,17,20
10:11	37:23 41:7,20	day 3:7 9:24	43:5
consider 18:9	counsel's 27:13	14:1,8,19 15:9	decisions 33:6
conspired	30:12	15:10 21:9,21	33:19 35:11
25:16	country's 25:8	22:10 23:10	39:11,18 40:1
contends 14:25	couple 13:25	25:3 30:20,20	43:16
17:11	22:22 35:9	45:13	declined 12:10
continue 40:16	course 15:16	days 12:4 22:9	12:11,21 18:9
continued 3:1	27:17 39:4	22:9,19,22	declining 40:2
4:1 5:1 6:1 7:1	court 1:1 15:5	24:9 27:16	deem 29:1
30:1	15:7 17:24	39:17	defendant 3:13
	18:8 23:12	37.11	3:20 4:2,12,18

Veritext Legal Solutions

[defendant - email]

5:2,8,14 6:12	41:5 42:25	discuss 40:5	dowd 2:3
defendants 3:2	depositions	discussing	dowling 4:12
6:2 28:19	21:9 28:20,21	15:13 23:21	28:19 41:4,18
defense 26:24	29:1 38:13	25:23,25 26:3	dowling's
definitely 30:19	description	39:13 40:16	26:24 37:21
demetriou 3:3	27:13	discussions	dozen 40:15,18
demonstrate	desired 17:2	27:18	draw 34:20
30:3	detail 21:14	disinterested	drive 7:4
denied 42:22	determine	26:7	dublin 2:15
dennis 5:14	11:17	dispute 10:16	due 39:4
department	determined	10:23 12:9,19	duffy 3:10
10:3 26:12,16	17:16,25 18:10	17:6,25 18:12	duration 30:17
depose 28:25	36:22	18:24 20:1	e
34:3,5	develop 16:19	38:18 42:1,7	
deposing 34:4	diego 2:8	42:15	e 3:20 8:2,2
deposition 9:25	difficulties	disrupt 28:16	45:3,3
10:21 11:3,18	16:11	36:14	east 5:5
12:2,8,11,14,17	direct 2:18	dissatisfied	eastern 1:3
13:1,3,11 14:2	directly 26:13	32:23	ebony 7:2 8:9
15:4,21,25	26:21 27:10	district 1:1,2	9:9,17
16:10,15,17,20	29:14	15:7	ecf 8:13
16:24 17:13	directors 10:13	division 1:3	edification 43:3
18:4,23 19:24	disagree 26:23	dmansfield	effect 16:10
20:7,12,15	36:6	5:22	25:15 39:8
21:2,6,19,21	disclose 26:1	docket 8:14	efficient 31:19
22:4,9,11,12	discoverability	20:10	efforts 43:19
23:3 24:7,11	11:1 14:23	document 1:7	either 32:17
25:3 27:17	discoverable	documents	39:8 43:2
28:3,4,8,23	38:19	10:10 11:6	ejtaft 5:6
29:7,11,20	discovery 13:5	20:3 22:13	elicit 12:18
30:1,18 31:1,7	15:14,22 17:4	35:19	ellis 4:13
32:4,8 33:10	28:17,18 29:4	doing 33:22	email 8:15,17
33:11 34:19,24	29:6,12 34:18	donald 3:4 4:2	8:22 13:14
35:14,24 36:5	36:14,23	douglas 5:19	19:6 23:19
38:7,8,16 40:3	, -	6	25:22 37:15
, , = = = =			43:17

[emails - forge] Page 6

emails 25:15	events 19:18	fact 15:13 18:6	firstenergy 1:5
emery 6:13	34:12	18:11,21 19:19	8:6 10:2 14:4
emily 5:4	eventually 27:1	31:15 36:23	14:24 16:8
employed	everybody 32:9	38:9	17:11 21:25
21:25	33:3 40:23	facts 31:17	24:5 25:25
employee 10:1	42:13	factual 36:7	27:4 35:18
18:23 19:18,20	everyone's	fairweather	firstenergy's
19:25 36:11	13:19 34:7	6:18	16:5 20:24
encourage	evidence 25:22	far 18:22 25:2	25:10
39:12	exchange 37:16	38:1	five 15:15 17:3
energy 3:13	exercise 30:24	favor 16:7	22:9
6:21	exist 35:3	29:18	fkaram 2:11
engage 28:9	expectation	favret 4:14	flexible 15:24
30:15	15:19	federal 21:9	36:19
engaged 27:7	expected 20:14	feel 21:3	flights 41:10
engaging 25:14	expedited	felt 23:5	flom 7:3
enter 9:7	43:21	fifth 21:3	floor 2:21 5:10
entire 30:24	expires 45:19	file 12:22 25:20	focus 26:25
entirety 45:8	explain 21:13	28:13 37:7,25	focused 20:21
entitled 30:2	explaining 43:5	filed 20:11	follow 15:22
32:16	explore 34:11	41:15 42:18	29:4,5,12
entity 24:4	exposed 27:21	final 11:25 15:4	34:18
esq 2:4,4,5,5,6	exposes 33:5	20:16 23:1,11	following 10:7
2:6,7,7,15,20	expressing	37:6	force 35:25
3:7,10,14,15,15	11:21	finally 21:12	forced 12:1,3,6
3:16,21,22 4:3	extend 36:23	36:18	12:25
4:8,14,14,20,20	extent 35:2	find 17:19	foregoing 45:7
5:4,9,10,15,19	extreme 30:13	18:16,22 27:5	forge 2:4 8:18
6:3,4,8,14,18	extremely 12:5	fine 22:25	8:23 9:11,12
6:22 7:4	33:24 34:9,15	40:16,19	9:12 13:14
established	eye 26:8	first 3:13 18:20	23:16,17 29:22
21:7	${f f}$	19:16 20:19	30:5,9 33:4
ethics 22:1	f 3:4 4:14,20	21:20 26:14	36:8 40:6,11
25:10 27:3	45:3	28:24 29:8	42:10,11,23
	10.0	33:7	43:7,11

[forge's - included]

forge's 19:5	gibson 5:19	guiffrar 3:18	hollowness
23:2 37:15	gilroy 2:7	guilty 40:13	27:21
41:4	giuffra 3:15	guys 39:18	honor 38:24
former 10:1	give 9:2,24 12:4	h	hoped 9:19
28:22	23:11 32:10	h 3:10	hostetler 3:21
forth 38:4	42:21	hand 45:12	hour 9:25
forward 10:21	given 12:7	happy 29:23	25:20 28:13
11:17,21,24	18:11 23:6	39:19	hours 12:5
12:8,14 13:4	32:16 38:17	harbor 6:21	21:22 31:8
16:20 17:3,8	gjritts 3:9	hard 34:20	house 27:9
18:7 31:23	go 19:15 22:23	haystack 18:22	29:14
37:14,19 38:16	23:20 29:19	19:1	householder
found 8:24	37:14 39:7	heaping 33:20	10:5
37:13	going 8:12	heard 9:18	hudson 2:20
four 39:17	13:20,24 19:5	37:22 40:7	hughes 4:7
fourth 20:18	19:8 25:2	hearing 1:14	huntington
francis 2:6	28:24 30:25	heart 10:15	6:23
frankly 25:8	31:23,24 32:23	12:19 20:22	hurricane 26:8
26:22 38:5,14	34:1,6,7,8 35:4	25:9 38:18	i
frustrating	36:17 40:8	heimann 2:19	iii 3:4
8:24	41:14	held 1:14	illinois 6:15 7:5
full 22:8,9	good 13:10	helms 6:14	impossible
30:20	16:23 18:11	help 35:1	29:12
fully 28:11	21:2 30:3 44:2	helpful 8:25	impractical
future 11:9	gotten 29:9	41:16,18,20,23	29:7
35:20	governmental	43:24	improper 13:7
g	24:4	hereunto 45:11	inaccuracies
g 6:22 8:2	grant 18:2	herrington 4:3	13:16
geller 2:3	granted 17:20	high 6:9,23	inaccuracy
general 10:4	great 33:4	highest 19:17	20:5
26:17,18	greenfield 1:21	19:20,24 26:11	inclined 18:2
geoffrey 3:7	45:5,18	26:15 27:8	29:19 43:1
geomey 3.7	guard 12:23	29:13 36:10	include 28:22
getting 11:19	guidance 40:24	history 25:6,8	included 11:5
43:3		1115t01 y 23.0,0	included 11.3
73.3			

[including - kept]

Г	1		
including 8:9	interrupt 13:18	j	13:17 15:8
10:4 37:2	32:19	j 3:3,3,3,7,14	16:1,13 18:13
inconvenience	interrupted	3:15	19:3,15 21:13
40:17	19:4 22:24	james 3:4 5:8	21:18 22:5,18
indicated 11:14	interviews 10:9	jason 2:4 3:2	22:23 23:13,16
37:12	intimately 36:8	9:12	23:18 29:16,25
indication	investigation	jerry 3:5	30:7 32:18,25
35:12	10:7,15 11:11	jfairweather	32:25 35:5
indictment	14:9,16 15:1	6:19	37:4 38:21,25
10:5,7	17:11,15,17	jforge 2:9	39:9,10 40:6
inferring 32:20	20:24 25:13	job 1:24 16:4	40:10 41:2,12
information	26:10 34:1,16	22:17 29:5,6	42:8,12,14,24
11:2 14:24	35:21 37:2	john 3:10 4:14	43:9,13
15:18 32:12	invited 40:15	4:14 5:2 6:18	julia 3:3
33:25 34:15	involve 11:7	41:2	july 37:1 45:19
initial 10:6	involved 18:23	john.favret	jump 9:4
initially 11:14	19:18 27:2,10	4:16	june 20:10,11
37:11	31:5 36:9 38:3	john.mccaffrey	27:14,15 38:2
inquire 10:19	israel 3:22	4:16	jurors 27:5
instance 21:20	issue 13:5,11	johnson 3:4	jury 27:1
insufficient	13:21 18:3,11	jolson 32:25	k
21:6	18:24 26:13	39:9	k 3:2
integrally 27:2	29:19 32:22	jon 3:2	karam 2:6
31:5	36:16,18,21	jones 3:7,20	karen 5:15
intentions	37:3,13 38:7	26:23 28:19	karen.pohlma
28:15	38:10 40:8	37:21,23	5:17
interest 29:2	issued 19:2	jonesday.com	katsiff 5:9
internal 10:6	39:3 42:16	3:9,12	katsifft 5:11
10:14 11:10	issues 11:11	joseph 2:15	keep 39:10,12
14:8,16 15:1	12:18 34:11	joshua 6:3	40:23
17:10,15,17	39:25	joshua.shinbrot	keeping 26:3
20:24 25:12	issuing 39:4	6:5	keeps 35:10
26:9 34:1,16		jr 3:15 6:8	kelly 2:7
35:21 37:2		judge 1:14 5:2	keny 2.7 kept 11:19
		8:4 9:11,14	NCPL 11.17
		0.7 7.11,17	

[kevin - matters] Page 9

kevin 2:6	largest 25:5,7	litigation 1:5	makes 18:14
key 3:22 10:10	late 29:10	8:7 28:17	making 18:6
18:23	law 18:17	litohio.com	33:6,19 42:21
kick 43:1	31:18 35:3	6:24	mansfield 5:19
kind 17:20	law.com 5:22	little 6:22 18:14	5:19
know 13:23	lchb.com 2:22	28:8 42:1	marbley 33:1
18:20 19:2	leaf 35:17	llc 5:19	39:10
21:20 23:4	leave 33:2	llp 2:3,14,19	march 29:10
24:18 27:6	leaving 12:22	3:14 4:3,13 5:4	marcie 7:4 9:8
30:13,19 31:16	left 17:4	5:9,15 6:3,8,13	marcie.lape 7:6
32:21,22 33:23	legal 10:3,11	6:22 7:3	marjorie 3:10
34:1,3,6,14,14	19:18,20,24	lmng 5:22	mark 24:17
40:12,14,15,17	26:12,16 27:9	location 27:19	market 5:10,16
40:18,21 41:7	29:14 31:16	logical 15:2	master 1:14 8:4
41:23,24 42:4	36:10	lolts 2:10	8:8 9:11,14
43:2	leila 4:18 19:25	long 24:19	10:17 12:20
knowledge	leslie 3:5	look 30:15	13:17 15:8
15:16 38:4	level 33:20	33:12 35:15	16:1,13 18:13
kscariani 2:11	lewis 5:15	lot 13:15 18:17	19:3,15 21:13
l	lexington 6:4	28:15	21:18 22:5,18
1 3:4,15,22 5:10	lieff 2:19	lucas 2:5	22:23 23:13,16
lake 6:14	light 10:22 19:9	luis 3:5	29:16,25 30:7
lakeside 3:8	28:15	m	32:18 35:5
lane 5:20	likely 11:7	m 2:7 3:3,5,14	37:4 38:21,25
lape 5:19 7:4	32:24	5:19	39:7 40:10
9:8,8,14,16	likewise 32:13	made 28:1,12	41:12 42:8,14
13:23 15:10	limbo 40:23	30:5 36:8 42:6	42:24 43:9,13
16:3,18 18:19	limited 30:16	magistrate	material 11:1
19:11,16 21:16	30:16 37:20	32:25 39:9	materials 14:12
21:19 22:7,20	line 34:21	main 4:15 6:18	14:13,15
22:25 23:15	lines 24:19	make 9:5 29:11	matter 8:20
35:8 37:8	40:25	32:5 33:8 34:2	9:19 18:6
38:24 41:22	lisowski 3:3	34:6 35:11	20:22 39:2,14
43:8	literally 26:15	39:11,24 41:10	matters 14:8
		41:11	23:23

[mccaffrey - number]

			I
mccaffrey 4:14	mitchell 3:4	36:3 37:24	need 12:23
41:2,3,17	mmiarmi 2:22	42:17,21	28:23 29:3,5
mcconnell 3:10	mmmb.com	motions 43:6	30:23 34:17,18
mcdermott	2:16	moul 2:14	39:8 40:4
6:13	moment 13:19	movant 8:9	43:10,21
mcdowell 6:17	32:19	17:23,24 41:3	needed 43:15
mciver 3:16	monday 13:21	movants 12:16	needing 29:10
mcivert 3:19	14:1 16:8	14:18 16:7	needle 18:22,25
meagher 7:3	19:10 27:23	move 10:20	nelles 3:15
mean 41:12	28:1,3 29:18	11:17,24 12:7	nelless 3:18
means 16:5	32:10,24 37:14	12:13 13:4	never 27:19
meet 15:24	39:5,14,21	16:20 17:2,8	30:9 35:3
member 26:12	40:9,24,25	18:7 19:23	new 2:21,21
26:16 27:9	41:16,21 42:16	28:8 29:7,23	3:17,17 4:21
29:13	42:19 43:6,24	32:7 37:19	4:21 6:5,5
memorandum	months 15:15	38:16	night 8:24
8:16	17:4 27:17	moved 38:13	non 7:2 8:9 9:9
memorializing	29:8 33:17	moving 11:21	9:24 12:2,25
43:4	moot 19:9,13	23:2	21:8,12
merits 36:12	morgan 5:15	mpduffy 3:12	notary 45:5,19
met 31:21,22	morganlewis	multiple 21:9	notes 43:25
32:2	5:17	21:22 38:12	45:10
miarmi 2:20	morning 9:18	murphy 2:14	notwithstandi
michael 2:20	13:21 37:23	4:3	12:8 13:4 17:3
3:3 4:12 41:3	41:6	murray 2:14,15	17:5
mid 10:18	morning's 14:1	2:16	november 1:16
midnight 25:19	morris 6:8	mwe.com 6:15	8:5 10:22 20:7
28:13	motion 8:13 9:4	n	23:3 32:8 33:2
mind 39:10	9:6,22 10:17	n 3:4 7:4 8:2	34:4,5,19,22
miner 4:20	10:25 11:16	nakasian 5:19	36:17 40:18
minimize 21:4	12:16,23 13:8	narrow 16:19	42:3 45:13
misconduct	13:22 17:21	20:21	number 8:10
25:14 27:6	20:8,11,23	necessary	8:13 10:2
misheff 3:4	25:20 27:14	15:22 43:23,25	28:20,21 40:14
	28:13 35:16,17	13.22 73.23,23	
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

[nw - plaintiffs] Page 11

nw 4:4	40:11	p	pending 10:16
0	olts 2:5	p 3:10 4:8 8:2	10:18,23,25
o 8:2	once 22:16	p.m. 8:19	11:16 12:9
o'connor 4:8	27:19	pam 43:20	18:25 20:1,8
o'neil 3:4	ones 26:20	pamela 1:21	43:6
object 14:20	open 28:7	45:5,18	pennsylvania
15:6 23:6	openly 25:22	pappas 3:5	5:11,16
27:16,18 32:24	25:25 26:3	paraphrase	people 8:22
33:13	opportunity	24:18	40:15,18
	9:18 23:11	parsell 6:22,24	pepich 2:5
objection 23:10	36:24	part 19:25 36:4	perfection 35:2
33:17 41:13	opposition 32:5	39:5	perfectly 24:15
objections 19:6	order 1:11 8:13		period 14:12,19
39:21	11:8,16 16:20	participated 10:9	15:6,9,11 17:4
obvious 40:13	18:3,4 22:4		23:10 25:11
obviously 42:5	23:12,20 25:21	participation 10:13	26:15,17 38:2
occur 41:5	28:14 37:24		38:12
october 10:18	42:17	parties 8:8 9:20	personally
14:10	ordered 11:9	15:13 21:22	42:13
offer 12:22	orders 39:7	39:12 42:5	phelms 6:15
21:4 23:2,5	43:4,20	party 7:2 8:9	philadelphia
28:10 40:19,25	ordinary 25:4,5	9:9,24 12:2,25	5:11,16
offered 12:12	orrick 4:3	15:17 16:23	phone 37:10
28:7	orrick.com 4:5	21:8,11,12	pianalto 3:5
office 45:12	outcome 31:3	26:7 38:2	pick 19:5
officer 25:10	outside 10:11	past 11:9 35:20	place 21:11
27:3	overall 41:25	pattern 18:21	plaintiff 16:21
oh 33:9	overcome 21:7	paul 3:3 6:14	17:12
ohio 1:2 2:16	oversight 10:8	payments	plaintiffs 2:2
3:8,11,23 4:9	overturned	25:23	2:18 8:17 9:13
4:15 5:5,21	14:21	payoffs 26:2	10:19 11:5,14
6:10,19,24	own 43:3	pearson 5:8	11:22 12:7,10
25:7 45:6,12	UWII 43.3	pease 5:4	12:21 13:3
45:19		pendency	14:14,19 16:16
okay 16:1 19:3		18:12	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
22:23 30:7			17:2,18 19:23

[plaintiffs - raised]

20:15 21:3	pre 30:21 31:9	32:22 36:16,18	protective 1:11
28:17 37:9	37:1	36:21 38:17	8:13 25:20
38:15 43:12	precisely 17:23	42:1	28:14 37:24
plan 28:18,18	preclude 16:16	privileged	42:17
36:14 37:14	predates 33:25	14:25 17:12,14	provide 25:21
planned 10:22	34:16	18:5 20:25	provided 37:17
please 18:3	prejudice 17:7	35:24	public 3:23
35:9 39:10	20:15	privy 15:17	25:5 45:5,19
43:17	prejudicial	probably 9:1	publicly 22:2
pohlmann 5:15	13:6	22:7 25:18	put 37:24 40:19
point 17:19	prep 22:8,19,21	problematic	q
23:23 28:11	22:21 24:10	33:6,19	question 24:15
33:4	prepare 22:4	procedure	24:16,24 37:6
pointed 34:25	22:16 24:12,13	21:10	questioned
pointing 40:13	prepared 10:10	proceed 16:16	22:15 24:3
points 13:14,16	14:6,7	31:18 32:13	questions 11:10
19:8,12 35:9	prepped 24:6	40:2 42:25	12:6 14:16
polk 6:3	prerogative	proceeding	17:10,14 18:5
porter 4:19 6:8	28:25	32:1 40:2	21:23 23:24
porterwright	president 22:1	proceedings	30:11 32:15
6:11	pretty 29:9	44:4 45:8	35:20,23 36:1
position 13:19	32:6 38:17	produce 35:18	quickly 13:13
14:22 37:22	43:25	produced 20:3	37:25
41:4	previously	22:13	quite 9:23
possibility	35:18	production	20:21 21:21
11:25 12:24	primary 20:20	11:6	25:2,8 38:4,14
20:2	35:17 36:2	productive	quote 24:18
possible 33:12	principle 21:7	34:2,6,9	_
33:14,14,16,18	privilege 10:16	promised 19:9	r
39:13	10:23 12:9,19	promptly 15:24	r 3:16 8:2 45:3
post 26:9 34:11	13:11,20,24	protect 16:4	rachael 3:22
37:1	14:4,5 16:5	32:6	rachel 2:4
postpone 27:20	17:5,16,25	protected	raised 13:14
powell 5:21	18:12,24 20:1	35:24	27:19 32:7
	20:16 29:19		

[randazzo - reyes]

	I		T
randazzo 19:19	rebuttal 35:7	20:19,19,20	required 22:11
25:17,24 26:3	recall 24:14	35:15,22 36:2	requirements
26:4,21 27:11	receive 43:23	37:18,20	25:24
29:15	received 8:14	reluctantly	requires 21:10
ranking 19:18	recently 19:23	8:25	requiring 13:2
19:20,24 26:12	recognize	remained 10:18	rescheduling
26:15 27:9	36:20	remarked 25:1	36:20
29:13 36:10	recognized	remember	resetting 15:25
rare 21:21 25:2	36:17	24:21,24	resolutions
rather 28:9,10	reconvene	remind 39:6	39:13
40:22	43:15	remotely 1:19	resolve 9:20
rationale 43:5	refer 8:17	30:17	36:18
rcocalis 2:9	reffner 6:12	rendered 31:24	resolved 13:12
rdr 1:21 45:18	26:19	rendon 3:21	36:16 38:6
reach 37:9	reflects 20:10	reopen 12:17	respect 29:5
43:17	refusal 21:1	16:24 17:13	38:19
reached 10:19	regarding 8:6	18:4 30:11	respectfully
11:20 37:20	9:6 14:23	31:1 32:4 33:9	27:5
read 8:15,16	23:25 24:4	34:11 35:13	respond 19:13
ready 9:15	27:12 32:3	36:5	35:9
14:15	regardless	reopened 30:18	response 24:16
real 28:15	19:14	30:23	42:10
reality 24:11	rein 3:14	reopening	responses
realized 38:9	reind 3:17	16:17 21:1	23:25
really 9:23	related 11:10	reporter 1:21	rest 44:2
11:12 18:21,25	12:18 14:8,25	request 12:10	result 39:25
20:21 21:10	17:10 18:5	12:12 16:14	40:1 41:14
23:22 34:12,18	20:4 35:20	27:19	43:16
38:18 41:1	relates 1:7	requested 8:23	results 17:7
42:12	relationship	11:5 20:18	revealed 30:12
reason 31:16	26:4	requesting	reverse 23:20
35:1 38:14	relevant 33:24	11:20	reviewed 10:10
40:12	34:15	require 22:14	14:13
reasons 25:19	relief 11:5	22:15	reyes 3:5
	16:14 17:20		

[rgrdlaw.com - special]

Page 14

_			_
rgrdlaw.com	santen 4:7	seen 11:23	sit 12:1,25 13:2
2:9,9,10,10,11	santenhughes	send 34:23	22:12
2:11,12,12	4:10	43:21	site 27:24
right 8:5 9:4	sat 22:19,20	sense 18:14	sitting 21:8
23:13 34:14	24:6	separated 14:9	situation 15:3
41:14 43:14	sater 5:4	served 10:2	skadden 7:3
risk 32:3	saturday 39:17	20:9	9:9
risrael 3:24	saw 19:2	sessions 22:8	skadden.com
ritts 3:7	saying 31:1	22:21,22	7:6
road 2:15 30:1	scenario 31:11	set 9:24 22:22	slate 7:3
33:10 43:1	schedule 29:1	28:20 45:11	smart 3:3
robbins 2:3	34:23,24	several 22:19	soon 43:22
robert 3:15	scheduled	37:10 40:15,17	sooner 40:25
6:12	39:22 40:3	seymour 5:4	42:11
role 10:5 26:11	41:5	sharon 3:15	sorry 22:24
roles 10:2	scheme 25:6	sharper 26:25	sort 31:3
rudman 2:3	schneider 4:2	shawn 1:14	sought 16:8
rule 14:3 16:7	sciarani 2:6	she'll 32:9	south 6:9,18,23
21:9 29:18	seal 45:12	sheds 28:14	southern 1:2
33:1	second 12:2	shi 4:20	spahr 5:9
ruling 10:24	13:1 20:5,20	shinbrot 6:3	speaker 41:19
11:16 14:17	21:6 22:12	showing 31:22	special 1:14 8:4
15:6 20:17	36:6	shown 21:2	8:8 9:11,14
36:21 37:13	secondhand	31:25	10:17 12:20
S	15:16	shows 13:8	13:17 15:8
s 1:21 2:6 3:21	securities 1:5	side 26:1 32:21	16:1,13 18:13
6:4,8 8:2 45:5	8:7	signature 25:24	19:3,15 21:13
45:18	see 26:23 27:1	45:16	21:18 22:5,18
sake 29:17	37:21 42:5	significant 22:3	22:23 23:13,16
sam 25:17	seek 20:20	31:6 38:17	29:16,25 30:7
26:21 27:10	35:13,22 36:5	silent 28:12	32:18 35:5
29:14	seeking 35:15	simply 17:1,9	37:4 38:21,25
san 2:8	36:3	30:23	39:7 40:10
sandra 3:5	seemed 16:21	single 28:11	41:12 42:8,14
			42:24 43:9,13

Veritext Legal Solutions

[specific - time] Page 15

	I		I
specific 20:22	steven 2:5 3:2,3	sullivan 3:14	38:25 39:1
speculating	stick 31:17,17	superior 26:20	42:23 43:7,8
30:22	strah 3:2	support 8:16	43:12,14,18,19
speculation	straightforward	supporting	44:1
30:25 33:7,20	9:23	18:17	thankfully
35:12	street 2:20 3:16	surprise 38:15	27:21
speculative	4:4,8,21 5:5,10	surprised	thing 16:3
31:2 36:4	5:16 6:9,14,18	18:16	things 13:25
spend 39:17	6:23	sutcliffe 4:3	27:12
spepich 2:10	structuring	t	think 13:15
square 3:23	25:23	t 3:3,4 45:3,3	15:2 18:15,19
standards	stuart 6:22	taft 5:4	19:12 23:24
31:16	subject 20:22	take 22:16	26:24 28:14
start 23:18	subjects 30:16	34:19	30:11 32:19
33:19 34:4	submit 8:22	taken 1:19 39:2	36:11 40:7
starting 28:3	31:7	takes 40:22	thinking 36:4
34:3 41:6	submitted 8:18	talk 16:13	third 19:20
starts 28:4	8:20 27:15	talking 26:6	26:7
state 25:6 45:6	subordinates	29:10 30:13,16	thomas 3:4,16
45:19	28:23	31:12 44:1	thornton 3:5
states 1:1	subpoena 13:9	taylor 3:2	thought 16:6
status 8:7	17:22 20:9	taylor 5.2 team 27:9	threat 24:1
39:22	27:14,25	29:14	three 14:10
stay 12:11	sue 3:5	telephone	28:8,9 32:11
13:10 15:3	sufficient 15:20	43:18	33:15,17
16:9 17:24	suggested 30:9	tell 13:19 24:20	threw 30:14
18:2,11 19:2	suggesting	24:22 41:13	thursday 1:16
36:15 37:3	30:24 31:10	terms 26:11	tigges 6:22
39:6	35:10	testify 14:6,7	till 37:7
stayed 20:16	suggests 35:22	testimony	time 10:4 11:18
39:8	suite 3:11,22	11:12 12:4,18	14:12,19 15:6
stenotype	4:9,15 5:20 6:9	28:24 36:25	15:20 17:4
45:10	6:14,18	thank 23:14,15	22:3,6,17 34:2
stenotypy 45:9	sullcrom.com	23:17 30:8	34:7,8,9,14
	3:17,18,18,19	35:5 37:4	36:12 38:2,12
		33.3 31.4	

[time - willing] Page 16

43:14	37:9	underwriter	want 13:3,13
timeline 38:5	tucker 4:13	6:2	16:16,21 19:7
timing 27:12,16	tuckerellis.com	undue 21:11	24:12,17 27:24
timothy 5:9	4:16,16	unduly 13:5	30:21 33:9
today 8:12 14:6	tuesday 9:25	31:4,24	35:2 38:16
14:22 39:16	16:10 28:4	unidentified	40:17
40:5 42:21	29:20 32:14	41:19	wanted 11:15
44:1	34:3,21 39:15	unique 18:21	12:13 37:12
today's 8:5	41:6	24:1	41:11
together 37:24	turner 3:5	united 1:1	wants 32:11
told 11:22	twain's 24:18	unquestionably	wardwell 6:3
27:22	two 9:24 12:4	25:16	washington 4:5
tomorrow	21:21 22:9,10	use 34:2,6	waste 34:7,8
39:16	25:3 27:15	v	way 23:22 29:8
took 43:25	29:8 43:15	vague 24:10	31:18,19 43:2
topics 22:14	type 31:6	vague 24.10 vespoli 4:18	ways 25:25
totally 24:25	u	19:25 26:19	we've 15:22
tower 3:22	uncertainty	vice 21:25	wednesday
town 41:8	13:5 14:23	videoconfere	10:1 29:21
traded 22:2	23:7	1:19	week 22:8
traditionally	under 1:11	vine 4:8	39:15,22 40:3
8:21	16:22 32:17	vorys 5:4	42:25 44:2
transcript	39:2	vorys.com 5:6	weeks 28:8,9
43:20 45:10	underlying	w	32:11 33:15
travel 41:20	42:7,15		37:10 43:15
tremendous	underscore	w 2:5	weinstein 6:4
31:13	41:4	wacker 7:4	went 10:12
tried 16:19	understand	wait 11:15	28:12
trigger 34:17	14:18 18:15,15	27:20 34:22	west 2:8 4:21
true 31:12 45:9	19:22 20:13	37:6,12	6:14
truth 24:20,22	42:9	waited 25:19	whatsoever
24:23	understanding	28:12 38:1	30:15 32:1
try 21:4	15:12,18 41:25	waived 14:5	whereof 45:11
trying 18:21	understood	wang 13:9	willing 34:22
31:9 34:20	11:4 38:11	17:22 27:25	

[wind - zoom] Page 17

wind 34:10	37:7,17,23
withheld 28:6	42:18
35:19	yiqing 4:20
witness 12:3	yiqing.shi 4:22
24:2 26:25	york 2:21,21
31:5 32:15	3:17,17 4:21
45:11	4:21 6:5,5
witnesses 11:8	Z
21:8 35:19	zeiger 6:22
work 22:3,10	zoom 1:19
worst 31:11	ZOOM 1.17
wright 6:8	
writing 39:18	
written 41:15	
42:16 43:4	
wrong 28:2	
wrote 45:8	
y	
yeah 35:8	
42:14	
years 14:10	
yeboah 7:2	
8:10 9:10,17	
9:22 10:8,14	
10:21 11:2,7	
11:13,18 12:1	
12:24 13:6	
14:5 15:21,23	
17:9 19:17	
20:6,9 21:5,17	
21:24 28:22	
33:24 35:14	
36:25	
yesterday 8:14	
8:18 13:15	